DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 461 249 EF 005 634

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Statewide School Facilities Needs Assessment Study: Comparison of State Construction Assistance Programs. |
| INSTITUTION | MGT of America, Inc., Tallahassee, FL. |
| PUB DATE | 1992-03-00 |
| NOTE | 43p.; A report to the Idaho School Facilities Needs Assessment Committee. |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160) |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Comparative Analysis; *Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Needs Assessment; Public Schools; *School Construction; *State Aid; State School District Relationship; Surveys |

ABSTRACT

This survey presents school facility funding, technology, and non-traditional programs currently used in the public school educational systems of the following twelve states: Alaska, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Mexico, Washington, and West Virginia. Each state reveals its current appropriation, funding source(s), local matching ratio, eligibility criteria, priority factors and weights, use of space standards, periodic needs assessment, technology enhancements, and non-traditional use of public school facilities. Appendices contain a detailed list of priority factors and weights for Alaska, Florida, and Maine; and the survey form used to gather the data. (GR)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 461 249

# Statewide School Facilities Needs Assessment Study

## Comparison of State Construction Assistance Programs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Debra Stage

2A

A Report to

The Idaho School Facilities
Needs Assessment Committee

MGT OF AMERICA, INC.

MARCH 1992

EF 005 634

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# STATEWIDE SCHOOL FACILITIES NEEDS ASSESSMENT STUDY

## COMPARISON OF STATE CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

## INTRODUCTION

Task 3.0 of the Project Work Plan provides for a survey of school facility funding, technology and non-traditional programs in other selected states. At the January 29, 1992 meeting, the Committee selected 12 states to be surveyed and approved the list of information to be gathered in the survey.

After identifying the appropriate official in each state, a questionnaire based upon the list of required information was mailed along with a letter requesting cooperation and indicating we would be calling to conduct the survey. (See Appendix D) All but one state, New Mexico, have been extremely cooperative, responding to the survey and providing manuals, responding to follow-up questions, etc. We greatly appreciate their assistance. The responses for each of the states are contained on the following pages. Each begins with a brief summary, followed by the responses to the specific questions.

We were also asked to provide information on the level of state expenditures for elementary and secondary school operations. In order to assure consistency given the different accounting and budgeting systems across the country, we accessed the information from State Government Finances in 1989 published by the U.S. Department of Commerce. The table which appears on page 28 provides the per capita expenditures for school district operations and contrasts those expenditures with total state operating expenditures exclusive of highways.

We believe that the information provided by the states on their program operation, priorities, and use of standards and needs assessments will be of considerable assistance to the committee. In addition, the experience of those states reporting programs of technology enhancement and promotion of non-traditional use of facilities can serve as a valuable resource in evaluating alternative approaches in Idaho.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


STATE SURVEYS PAGE

Alaska . . . . . 1
Connecticut . . . . . 3
Florida . . . . . 5
Georgia . . . . . 8
Illinois . . . . . 10
Kentucky . . . . . 13
Maine . . . . . 15
Maryland . . . . . 17
Massachusettes . . . . . 19
New Mexico . . . . . 22
Washington . . . . . 23
West Virginia . . . . . 25

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - Detailed List of Priority Factors and Weights for the State of Alaska . . . . . 29
APPENDIX B - Detailed List of Priority Factors for the State of Florida . . . . . 32
APPENDIX C - Detailed List of Priority Factors and Weights for the State of Maine . . . . . 33
APPENDIX D - Survey Instrument, State Construction Assistance Programs . . . 35

STATEWIDE SCHOOL FACILITIES NEEDS ASSESSMENT STUDY

COMPARISON OF STATE CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

ALASKA

Funds are distributed to the Alaska school districts by the Department of Education. Each school district is responsible for the design and construction of the project with minimum oversight from the Department. Although Alaska has a "needs based" school construction program, the state currently does not have the money available to fund projects further down the priority list than the first handful of projects of Priority Type I - Life/Safety. The state does not have any expectation that the needs based ranking will be used as the sole mechanism for allocating funds as grants have been made to recipients named by the Legislature.

*Administering agency:* Department of Education

*Current appropriation:* $30,000,000 (1991-92 FY)

*Funding source(s):* General fund

*Local matching ratio:* No local match required

*Eligibility criteria:* All districts are eligible. All projects are ranked concurrently using the priority factors described below.

*Priority factors and weights:* Projects are evaluated using the following priorities:

- Priority Type I - Life/Safety
- Priority Type II - Unhoused Students
- Priority Type III - Protection of Structure
- Priority Type IV - Code Upgrade
- Priority Type V - Operational Cost Savings
- Priority Type VI - Functional Upgrade

Appendix A contains the detailed priority factors and weights.

*Source(s) of local matching and type of majority vote required:* No local match by the districts is required.

*Use of space standards:* The following space standards are used:

- Elementary schools - 100 gross square feet per student
- Secondary schools - 150 gross square feet per student

*Periodic needs assessment:* A needs assessment is not required.

*Data processing system for the program:* The Department is currently bringing a system on line.

*Technology enhancements:* Alaska does not currently have a formal program in place to fund technology enhancements of public school facilities.

*Non-traditional use of public school facilities:* Alaska does not currently have a formal program in place to promote the non-traditional use of public school facilities but it is encouraged.

## CONNECTICUT

Control of Connecticut's schools rests with the local school boards. The Department of Education reviews the projects for code conformance and compliance with the Table of Net Area Recommended Ranges. All school construction projects are subject to state legislative approval on an annual listing, except for those projects dealing with correction of code violations. The state grant is paid to the districts over the same time period as the local bond issue.

***Administering agency:*** Department of Education

***Current appropriation:*** $148,000,000 (1991-92 FY)

***Funding source(s):*** General fund

***Local matching ratio:*** 20 - 80%

***Eligibility criteria:*** All districts are eligible. Their projects are placed in one of the following categories.

Category One
Primarily required to create new facilities or alter existing facilities to provide for mandatory instructional programs, for physical education facilities in compliance with Title IX where such programs or compliance cannot be provided within existing facilities, or for the correction of code violations which cannot be reasonably addressed within existing program space.

Category Two
Primarily required to create new facilities or alter existing facilities to enhance instructional programs or provide comparable facilities among schools to all students at the same grade level(s) within the district unless such project is otherwise explicitly included in another category.

Category Three
Primarily required to create new facilities or alter existing facilities to provide supportive services, which do not include swimming pools, auditoriums, outdoor athletic facilities, tennis courts, elementary school playgrounds, site improvements, garages, storage, parking, or general recreation areas.

***Priority factors and weights:*** Projects are not prioritized in rank order but are placed in one of the three categories described above. While Category One is considered top priority, a district may undertake a project in Category Two prior to conducting a project in Category One.

***Source(s) of local matching and type of majority vote required:*** Local matching is provided through bonds which require a simple majority vote.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*Use of space standards:* The Department provides space guidelines for school construction which contain recommendations for elementary and secondary classrooms, specialized facilities (e.g., library media center, physical education) and ancillary facilities in terms of:

- the maximum number of pupils;
- the range of square feet per pupil station; and
- the range of net total square feet.

The guidelines for net area do not include storage space. If a district proposes a project with area outside the recommended range, the size requires explanation and justification.

*Periodic needs assessment:* A needs assessment is not required.

*Data processing system for the program:* The Department does not currently have a system.

*Technology enhancements:* Connecticut does not currently have a formal program in place to fund technology enhancements of public school facilities. Required renovations for program enhancement are a Category Two project and are subject to legislative approval.

*Non-traditional use of public school facilities:* Connecticut does not currently have a formal program in place to promote the non-traditional use of public school facilities but it does encourage community use.

FLORIDA

Florida has one of the more comprehensive state-level programs. The Department of Education (DOE) maintains an extensive formula-based system to allocate state funds. Although the facility survey, which is conducted once every five years for each district, is independent of funding, it dictates what can be built. All projects for the district must be recommended during the survey. If a district has met all of its capital outlay needs, as determined by the survey, it may request approval to spend the funds for purposes other than capital outlay. The request must give priority to providing custodial care for buildings and grounds and to purchasing instructional supplies and equipment.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *Administering agency:* | Department of Education | |
| *Current appropriation:* | $525,985,578 | Public Education Capital Outlay (PECO) |
| | + 76,427,307 | Capital Outlay & Debt Service (CO&DS) |
| | $602,412,885 | (1991-92 FY) |
| *Funding source(s):* | Utilities tax (87%)<br>License tag fees (13%) | |
| *Local matching ratio:* | Project oriented; 59% of capital outlay needs are funded locally (1991-92) | |

*Eligibility criteria:* All districts are eligible. The level of funding from each source (PECO, CO&DS) is determined as follows:

- PECO Funds
  These funds are distributed on a formula basis for:
  - maintenance, renovation and site improvements based on total gross square feet and age of the building, amortized over 50 years; and
  - new construction, which is allocated based on the FTE student population of the district four years ago (40%) and growth over the next four years (60%).
- CO&DS Funds
  These funds are distributed on an instructional unit (23 FTE) basis.

*Priority factors and weights:* The priority factors differ for each source of funding (PECO, CO&DS).

- PECO Funds
  - Priority A - General Instructional Facilities
  - Priority B - Special and Auxiliary Facilities
  - Priority C - Facilities Maintenance

  Appendix B contains the detailed priority factors.

- CO&DS Funds
  Projects funded with CO&DS funds are prioritized by each local school district board taking into account the following factors:

  1. Student stations
  2. Student support space
  3. All other space
  4. Equipment purchase

No weights are used in conjunction with the priority factors.

***Source(s) of local matching and type of majority vote required:*** Local funding is provided through bonds which require a simple majority vote. The district does not have to pass a bond to obtain state funds.

***Use of space standards:*** The Florida Administrative Code provides extensive and elaborate planning standards for new facilities. The Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) manual provides comprehensive and detailed space standards for current public school facilities.

***Periodic needs assessment:*** A required needs assessment, although independent of funding, dictates what each district can build. The DOE establishes the schedule to insure that the assessment is conducted every five years. The facility survey is lead by a DOE staff member and comprised of volunteers who donate one week of their time. In addition, a computerized inventory system is maintained by DOE. The system contains room by room data for each building in a district.

***Data processing system for the program:*** The districts' facility surveys are updated every five years based on the new facility surveys. The computerized inventory system is updated annually by the districts and verified by DOE staff during the facility survey. Both systems are maintained by the Florida Northwest Regional Data Center.

***Technology enhancements:*** Initial funding for technology enhancements will be appropriated during the 1992-93 fiscal year. Approximately $30 million will be appropriated to retrofit buildings. Additionally, funding for new building will provide for equipment as well as the necessary building system to support technology.

***Non-traditional use of public school facilities:*** Florida has several programs to promote the non-traditional use of public school facilities.

- Increase Utilization: In an effort to promote year-round schools, any district which generates 20% more FTE than capacity, is funded $100 per FTE.
- Community Use Projects: Projects proposed for joint school/community use will be reimbursed by the state for 50% of the total cost of the project.
- Joint Use Projects: Projects proposed jointly by two or more school boards (public and/or community college), will be reimbursed by the state for 25% of the total cost of the project.
- Building for Private Employers: The state pays for all or a portion of the building(s) which are amortized over 40 years. The local school board provides the instruction.
- Full Service Schools: Working with the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services (HRS), the DOE provides partial funding to encourage building centers on a school site.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## GEORGIA

Georgia's program emphasizes local facilities plans, the use of an up-to-date room-by-room inventory and needs assessment conducted locally with technical support from state consultants. In 1986, a law was implemented which recommended district grade organizational patterns and base sizes. As an incentive, districts are provided advance funding to meet these recommendations. Many districts are in the process of closing and merging schools.

In order to receive its entitlement, each district must file a long-range facility plan with the Department of Education (DOE) every five years. The district's entitlement is computed by applying the ratio of available state funding to total unmet need statewide to the total unmet need of the district. The entitlement request must not exceed the district's annual entitlement plus any accumulated entitlements remaining from previous years.

| | |
|---|---|
| *Administering agency:* | Department of Education |
| *Current appropriation:* | $173,000,000 (1991-92 FY) |
| *Funding source(s):* | Bonds |
| *Local matching ratio:* | Varies based on the wealth of the district (approximately 10-25%) |

*Eligibility criteria:* All districts are eligible. However, in order to participate, each district have an approved long-range facility plan on file with the DOE. The entitlement request must not exceed the district's annual entitlement plus any accumulated entitlements remaining from previous years.

*Priority factors and weights:* Projects are not prioritized at the state level. Each school district prioritizes their projects in the long-range facilities plan.

*Source(s) of local matching and type of majority vote required:* Local funding is provided through bonds which require a simple majority vote.

*Use of space standards:* Extensive and elaborate square footage requirements are provided for use in development the local facilities plans. These requirements are used in calculating existing capacity and in planning for new facilities.

*Periodic needs assessment:* A required needs assessment, which is completed every five years and updated annually, includes building condition information and square footage needs. The assessment is conducted by the individual school districts and certified by an architect, who includes accurate cost information.

*Data processing system for the program:* The districts' long-range facility plans, including the building condition information are maintained on hard copy only.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

***Technology enhancements:*** Georgia does not currently have a formal program in place to fund technology enhancements of public school facilities. Required renovations for program enhancement are identified on a project-by-project basis and are generally funded at a 50% matching rate.

***Non-traditional use of public school facilities:*** Georgia does not currently have a formal program in place to promote the non-traditional use of public school facilities but it does encourage community use.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ILLINOIS

Illinois provides two types of grant entitlements under the Capital Assistance Program. In addition to the construction grant entitlement described below, the state also provides entitlement for debt service. In order to be eligible for a debt service grant entitlement, the district must have an approved district facility plan on file with the State Board of Education and must have issued and sold bond for capital improvement after January 1, 1969. Approval for the same project under each type of entitlement is not permitted.

While Illinois has not provided construction grants since 1980, an eligibility system is in place which provides minimum enrollment and maximum space standard guidelines for new facilities and new additions to existing facilities. Additionally, guidelines exist for the remodeling/rehabilitation of current facilities.

*Administering agency:* State Board of Education (SBE)

*Current appropriation:* $0 (1991-92 FY)
Last appropriation: 1980

*Funding source(s):* General fund

*Local matching ratio:* 30 - 80%

*Eligibility criteria:* The district must complete the following requirements to be eligible for a construction grant:

- An approved District Facility Plan is on file with SBE.
- A definable project has been set forth in the District Facility Plan.
- The priorities for financial assistance (as described in the next section) have been met.
- The selection of sites gives maximum effect to all federal and state statutory and administrative requirements.
- The project complies with Title IX.
- Minimum enrollment requirements have been met.

*Priority factors and weights:* Grants are awarded in the following order:

First Priority - Emergency

1. Replace or rehabilitate facilities substantially damaged by natural or emergency conditions.
2. Contribute to elimination and prevention of segregation.

Second Priority - Health/Life Safety

1. Replace or rehabilitate facilities determined to be a severe and continuing hazard.

2. Contribute to elimination and prevention of segregation.

Third Priority - Unhoused Student Index

1. Replace or rehabilitate facilities to accommodate current unhoused students.

2. Contribute to elimination and prevention of segregation.

The following special factors may be considered in making the final determination of priority:

1. Unique solutions to facility needs through multiple use of facilities.

2. Critical shortage of facilities due to condemnation of building(s).

3. Unique facility needs regarding vocational and/or special education.

4. More than 50 percent of current student population is unhoused.

5. Aids in the consolidation of school districts.

No weights are used in conjunction with the priority factors.

***Source(s) of local matching and type of majority vote required:*** The district's local matching financing requirements come from referendum bonds and require a simple majority vote.

***Use of space standards:*** Gross square feet (GSF) per student space standards and minimum enrollments needed to build are provided for new construction, new additions to existing buildings and remodeling/rehabilitating existing structures.

1. New Construction: Minimum enrollment requirements exist for the construction of new facilities. Maximum standards (gross square feet per student) for each school type are used for the determination of the state share of the recognized project cost for new construction.

2. New Additions to Existing Buildings: Minimum enrollment requirements exist for the construction of new additions. The standards described above also apply to new additions to existing buildings.

3. Remodeling/Rehabilitating Existing Structures: Developed on an individual basis with space per student not to exceed standards described above and with unit costs not to exceed standards for new construction.

***Periodic needs assessment:*** A needs assessment is required and submitted upon application for a construction grant. The needs assessment includes:

- current condition of educational facilities and the district's intent toward these facilities; and

- description of the current capacity of existing buildings and classrooms available for instructional purposes.

Space considered unsuitable for educational program may be judged inadequate and therefore reported as having no capacity.

***Data processing system for the program:*** The system is administered jointly by SBE and the Capital Development Board and is updated periodically.

***Technology enhancements:*** Illinois does not currently have a formal program in place to fund technology enhancements of public school facilities.

***Non-traditional use of public school facilities:*** Illinois does not currently have a formal program in place to promote the non-traditional use of public school facilities.

KENTUCKY

Kentucky has two programs. In the first, the state funds $100 per child and equalizes (up to 150%) the local tax of $0.05/$100. The second program, which is a voluntary program, is described below. Of the districts involved in the latter program, 75 to 80 percent receive close to 100 percent of their funding request.

In order to participate in the voluntary program, each district must file a facility plan with the Department of Education (KDE). Each eligible district is then offered sufficient funding to finance construction of the portion of its unmet need. The district's allocation is computed by applying the ratio of available state funding to total unmet need statewide to the total unmet need of the district.

*Administering agency:* School Facilities Construction Commission

*Current appropriation:* $13,542,800 (1990-92 biennium)

*Funding source(s):* General fund

*Local matching ratio:* Varies based on the financial ability of the district

*Eligibility criteria:* The district must have a minimum $100,000 unmet need. The financial eligibility requirements are:

- cash from capital outlay account ($110 per child),
- cash from special voted building account,
- bonding potential of the capital outlay funds, and
- surplus in excess of 10% of general fund budget as of June 30 of the year prior to the legislative session.

Cash amounts must be escrowed for the offer of assistance, plus any bonding potential which may be available to that district at the same date. The cash amounts are escrowed in order to dedicate these funds to the capital projects.

*Priority factors and weights:* There are no factors and weights; however, the offers of assistance must be spent in accordance with the district's #1 priority of the facility plan prepared with the state's assistance through KDE.

*Source(s) of local matching and type of majority vote required:* A district's local matching or eligibility financing requirements come from the capital outlay account, the special voted building fund, or the general fund monies. There is no required vote by the people in the school district.

*Use of space standards:* The annual School Facilities Manual prepared by the State Board for Elementary and Secondary Education provide extensive and elaborate planning standards for new facilities as well as accreditation building criteria for existing facilities.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

***Periodic needs assessment:*** A needs assessment is required and submitted with each facility plan. The Department of Education establishes the schedule to insure that the assessment is no older than four years. The facility survey is conducted by KDE staff; relevant information (e.g., recent health report, fire safety inspection report) is provided by the district prior to the survey.

***Data processing system for the program:*** A computerized inventory system is maintained by KDE. The system contains room by room data for each building in a district. Currently, 85% of the districts are on the system. The districts' needs statements are maintained by the KDE and updated annually based on new facility plans.

***Technology enhancements:*** Initial funding for technology enhancements was appropriated during the 1990 legislative session. Approximately $32 million will be appropriated each year to link the state-level public school agency(s) with the public schools. Additionally, the funding will provide for an upgrade of in-house system of each school. Specific objectives and criteria for this project are still in the development stage.

***Non-traditional use of public school facilities:*** Kentucky does not currently have a formal program in place to promote the non-traditional use of public school facilities. The summer session was funded for the first time during 1990-91.

MAINE

Maine's program funds school construction at the same rate as the basic foundation subsidy rate, and a "circuit breaker" mechanism is in place which requires the state to assume the costs above a certain local mill rate. The rates (subsidy and mill) are calculated each fiscal year. Local school districts identify their own school construction needs and all projects must be approved by the local voters.

*Administering agency:* Department of Education

*Current appropriation:* $67,000,000 (1992-93 FY)

*Funding source(s):* State tax revenue

*Local matching ratio:* 42.7% (current average)

*Eligibility criteria:* All districts are eligible.

*Priority factors and weights:* Prior to rating a project, DOE staff conduct an on-site review of the district. Projects are evaluated using the following priorities:

A. Regular Projects

1. Building and Grounds
2. School Population
3. Program

B. Special Projects

Any construction project with maximum of 8,000 sq. ft. Costs necessary to bring a building into conformance with current mechanical and handicapped codes are included.

1. Safety Hazards
2. Completion of Facility
3. Overcrowding

C. Replacement of Leased Space Projects

Limited to additions to existing facilities to eliminate need for portables or other types of leased space to house instructional programs.

1. Number of Leased Spaces to be Replaced
2. Age of Building

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. Enrollment Estimates

Appendix C contains the detailed priority factors and weights. No modernization projects are allowed because it is cheaper to replace buildings. Historical buildings are sold to private corporations or used by the community.

***Source(s) of local matching and type of majority vote required:*** The district's local share comes from bonds and requires a simple majority vote. The district does not have to pass a bond to obtain state funds.

***Use of space standards:*** The State Board of Education rules provide extensive space allocation recommended maximum allowances for new facilities. Any proposed project containing more than the maximum allowance requires substantial documentation.

***Periodic needs assessment:*** A needs assessment is not required currently. The most recent assessment of facility conditions was conducted in 1973. Funding for a statewide needs assessment is proposed for next year's budget.

***Data processing system for the program:*** The DOE does not have a computerized system for maintaining information with respect to the construction assistance program.

***Technology enhancements:*** Maine does not currently have a formal program in place to fund technology enhancements of public school facilities.

***Non-traditional use of public school facilities:*** Maine does not currently have a formal program in place to promote the non-traditional use of public school facilities but it does encourage community use. The State Board of Education set up a task force in the summer of 1991 to study the year-round utilization of public school facilities.

MARYLAND

Through the use of an Interagency Committee (IAC), Maryland's school districts receive planning approval in an approved annual capital improvement program or amendment. Project approval, however, cannot be interpreted as a guarantee of construction funding. Although each school district establishes priorities for its local capital program in an educational facilities master plan, these priorities are evaluated with respect to other projects in the state.

*Administering agency:* Public School Construction Program

*Current appropriation:* $66,000,000 (1991-92 FY)

*Funding source(s):* Bonds

*Local matching ratio:* 25 - 50%

*Eligibility criteria:* All districts are eligible. However, all projects must have IAC planning approval in an approved annual capital improvement program or amendment.

*Priority factors and weights:* The following priority classifications are based upon project type:

1. New Construction: Projects to construct new schools or additions to existing schools for the purpose of providing instructional space for significant additional student capacity. Within this priority category, preference is given, as applicable, to basic instructional spaces, such as classrooms and laboratories. Auxiliary gyms, swimming pools and auditoriums, as part of this type of project, may be separated as an add alternative, and may be deleted, depending upon available funds.

2. Renovation (building in use more than 40 years): Projects to replace or renovate all or parts of existing schools that have been in use for more than 40 years, where the purpose is not to provide significant additional capacity. Enrollment data must support the project. Auxiliary gyms, swimming pools and auditoriums, as part of this type of project, may be separated as an add alternative, and may be deleted, depending upon available funds.

3. Renovation (building in use more than 25 years): Projects to add to or to renovate all or parts of existing schools that have been in use for more than 25 years, where the purpose is not to provide significant additional capacity. Enrollment data must support the project. This category does not include the "limited use" additions or renovations described in category 5.

4. Renovation (building in use 15 to 25 years): Projects to add to or to renovate all or parts of existing schools that have been in use for more than 15 years, where the purpose is not to provide significant additional capacity. Enrollment data must support the project. This category does not include the "limited use" additions or renovations described in category 5.

5. "Limited Use" Additions: Projects to provide "limited use" additions such as auditoriums, gyms, locker rooms, or expanding or altering existing facilities of this nature.

6. Less Critical Facilities: Projects to provide less critical facilities which quality under the rules and regulations, such as: swimming pools, food service space improvements, site modifications, and outdoor education facilities.

***Source(s) of local matching and type of majority vote required:*** The districts source of local funds comes from bonds. Maryland's twenty-four districts (twenty-three counties and Baltimore City) have different voting requirements depending on the type of governance (charter, code or commission).

***Use of space standards:*** The state-funded allocation for the construction of school projects are limited by maximum gross square feet per pupil allowances. These maximum allowances are not considered a minimum state space design standard.

***Periodic needs assessment:*** A needs assessment is required through the annual submittal of or amendment to an educational facilities master plan.

***Data processing system for the program:*** The Maryland Public School Construction Program maintains the data processing system for the construction assistance program, which is updated monthly through a printout.

***Technology enhancements:*** Building systems necessary to support technology enhancements are eligible as part of any renovation, addition or new building construction project. However, funding for equipment is not included.

***Non-traditional use of public school facilities:*** Maryland does not currently have a formal program in place to promote the non-traditional use of public school facilities but it does encourage community use. Any additional square footage desired by a community (e.g. an larger gym) is funded through the local parks and recreation budget.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## MASSACHUSETTS

Massachusetts' districts must borrow for 100% of project cost. The district is then reimbursed for the Commonwealth's share. In order to apply for a grant, the district must file a long-range educational plan and facilities needs assessment with the Department of Education (DOE).

*Administering agency:* Department of Education

*Current appropriation:* $145,000,000 (1991-95)

*Funding source(s):* State tax revenue

*Local matching ratio:* 10 - 50%

*Eligibility criteria:* All districts are eligible.

*Priority factors and weights:* Projects are evaluated using the following priorities:

A. Category 1 Projects:

1. Ensure health and safety
2. Implement court-ordered racial balance plans
3. Implement Board-approved and voluntary racial balance plans

Projects are further reviewed to determine if:

a. facilities are defined in racial balance plan;

b. overcrowding exists in addition to racial imbalance; and/or

c. accreditation is in jeopardy or deficiencies exist.

B. Category 2 Projects:

1. Alleviate existing overcrowding
2. Prevent overcrowding from increasing enrollments
3. Provide full-range of educational programs and maintain full accreditation

Projects are further reviewed to determine if:

a. overcrowding coexists with accreditation deficiencies;

b. overcrowding can be demonstrated;



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

c. projected overcrowding coexists with accreditation deficiencies; and/or

d. potential overcrowding can be demonstrated.

C. Category 3 Projects:

All other significant facility needs.

No weights are used in conjunction with the priority factors.

***Source(s) of local matching and type of majority vote required:*** Most districts issue municipal bond issues to fund the project(s). The district must pass a bond to obtain state funds, which are received on a reimbursement basis. The required vote for the passage of bonds and differs by the type of entity that the district is a part of.

***Use of space standards:*** The following space standards are used:

- Elementary Schools
  Not more than 115 gross square feet per student in planned enrollment
- Middle/Junior High Schools
  Not more than 135 gross square feet per student in planned enrollment
- Secondary Schools (General or Academic)
  Not more than 155 gross square feet per student in planned enrollment
- Vocational Technical Schools
  Not more than 255 gross square feet per student in planned enrollment

Additionally, each capital construction project must provide adequate and appropriate space to accommodate early childhood programs, as appropriate, programs for students with special needs, or linguistic minority students who, for lack of space, are not currently served in regular public school facilities.

***Periodic needs assessment:*** A needs assessment is required only if a district applies for a grant. The DOE does not have the authority to request the education plan or needs assessment unless a grant has been applied for.

***Data processing system for the program:*** The DOE has a computerized system for maintaining grant information with respect to the construction assistance program.

***Technology enhancements:*** Massachusetts does not currently have a formal program in place to fund technology enhancements of public school facilities. However, a new program has been proposed for FY 1993; approximately $5,000,000 is expected to be allocated for a pilot project. Very broad legislation only has been filed, and as of yet, no regulations have been promulgated.

***Non-traditional use of public school facilities:*** Massachusetts does not currently have a formal program in place to promote the non-traditional use of public school facilities. However, a proposal has been filed with the Education Committee to increase support for community programs (e.g. day care, elderly feeding) in public school facilities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## NEW MEXICO

New Mexico has not responded to our request for information. However some tentative information is available from other sources.

New Mexico's program only provides grant assistance to districts without local resources.

***Administering agency:*** Department of Education

***Current appropriation:***

***Funding source(s):***

***Local matching ratio:***

***Eligibility criteria:*** Only districts without local resources are eligible.

***Priority factors and weights:*** Projects are evaluated using the following priorities:

1. Unhoused students
2. Program deficiencies cited by state accreditation
3. Flagrant code violations and provisions for handicapped access

## WASHINGTON

Washington's program provides matching funds for instructional and instructional support space to eligible school districts based upon State Board of Education priorities with matching based on the districts' assessed property values. A new priority system is currently under review by the State Board of Education.

*Administering agency:* Superintendent of Public Instruction/Board of Education

*Current appropriation:* $410,000,000 (1991-93 biennium)

*Funding source(s):* Timber sales from state school trust lands, General Fund and General obligation bonds

*Local matching ratio:* 10 - 80%

*Eligibility criteria:* Unhoused students with unavailable suitable school facilities in contiguous school districts. In addition, modernization of eligible space in excess of 20 years of age is considered for eligibility.

*Priority factors and weights:* The current priority system allocates funds, in order, to districts:

1. With unhoused students for construction of new school facilities
2. With condemned educational facilities
3. For modernization of existing school facilities.

All instruction and support space are weighted equally.

A new priority system is presently under consideration by the State Board of Education which places all eligible projects on a one-tiered priority system. Projects receive weighted scores based on:

- the type of space to constructed or modernized;
- cost/benefit ratio;
- unhoused students (in the case of new construction); and
- condition of facilities (in the case of modernization).

*Source(s) of local matching and type of majority vote required:* The district's local share comes from school construction bond issues and requires a 40% turn out of the number of voters in the previous general election in addition to a 60% majority vote.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*Use of space standards:* The following space standards are used for state assistance funding.

- Elementary Schools - 80 gross square feet per student
- Middle/Junior High Schools - 110 gross square feet per student
- Secondary Schools - 120 gross square feet per student
- Classrooms for exclusive use by handicapped students - 140 gross square feet per student

*Periodic needs assessment:* A district-wide study and survey is required to be completed and on file at the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) as a condition for receipt of state assistance. Study and surveys less than six-years-old may be updated in lieu of preparing a complete study and survey.

*Data processing system for the program:* Construction projects are tracked by SPI. In addition, data on school facilities is updated by SPI as new facilities are added to existing school district inventories.

*Technology enhancements:* Washington does not currently have a formal program in place to fund technology enhancements of public school facilities. However, the school construction program does recognize technological enhancements in new construction and modernization projects which are otherwise eligible for state assistance.

*Non-traditional use of public school facilities:* Washington does not currently have a formal program in place to promote the non-traditional use of public school facilities. Any such programs are within the jurisdiction of the local school districts.

WEST VIRGINIA

Each district (one in each of the 55 counties) has been placed into a Regional Education Service Agency (RESA) district (total of 8). Each district submits their ten-year Comprehensive Educational Facilities Plan (CEFP) to the RESA for approval of individual projects. Each regional plan prioritizes all projects both within a district and among the districts. In prioritizing the projects, each RESA makes determinations in accordance with the objective criteria formulated by the School Building Authority (SBA). Counties are funded as follows:

- 48.5% allocation on a per student basis;
- 48.5% allocation on a priority needs project basis; and
- 3.0% allocation to state-wide projects (i.e. vocational/technical centers.

*Administering agency:* School Building Authority

*Current appropriation:* $21,444,493 (1991-92 FY)

*Funding source(s):* 50% of the funds which accrue due to an increase in local share (assessed valuation on real estate)

*Local matching ratio:* None - state-sponsored program

*Eligibility criteria:* All districts are eligible. However, each RESA must submit a region-wide ten-year CEFP that addresses the facilities needs of each county within the RESA. Any county board that fails to expend the grant money within three years of the allocation forfeits the allocation and therefore shall be ineligible for further net enrollment or other allocations until that county board is ready to expend the funds in accordance with their CEFP. Any forfeited amount is added to the total funds available for allocation and distribution in the next fiscal year.

*Priority factors and weights:*

Prioritizing by RESA. A district's facility plan must address how the proposed project will further the following goals of quality education.

- Student health and safety
- Economies of scale, including compatibility with similar schools that have achieved the most economical organization, facility utilization and pupil-teacher ratios (i.e. downsizing to adjust for enrollment loss)
- Reasonable travel time and practical means of addressing other demographic considerations
- Multi-county and regional planning to achieve the most effective and efficient instructional delivery system
- Curriculum improvement and diversification, including computerization and technology and advanced senior courses in science, mathematics, language arts, and social studies



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Innovations in education such as year-round schools and community-based programs
- Adequate space for projected student enrollment

No weights are used in conjunction with the priority factors.

Prioritizing by SBA. Upon receipt of the regional CEFPs, SBA automatically drops the bottom half of each RESA's list. An architectural/engineering team are sent to conduct an on-site review. A list is prepared for the SBE, who interview each superintendent and district president. The SBE makes the final decision.

***Source(s) of local matching and type of majority vote required:*** The district may augment state funds through local bonds which requires a simple majority vote. The district does not have to pass a bond to obtain state funds.

***Use of space standards:*** The SBE has issued a policy statement which incorporates educational space standards. The following ranges of space standards are used for funding specific facility plans. Each type of school has numerous standards depending upon the range of students to be housed. The low and high for each type of school has been shown.

- Elementary Schools
  - Up to 240 students - 125 gross square feet per student
  - Over 541 students - 80 gross square feet per student
- Middle/Junior High Schools
  - Up to 500 students - 150 gross square feet per student
  - Over 1,000 students - 100 gross square feet per student
- Secondary Schools
  - Up to 500 students - 230 gross square feet per student
  - Over 1,500 students - 140 gross square feet per student

***Periodic needs assessment:*** Annually, each district must report any revisions to their CEFP to the SBA. In addition, every 10 years each district is required to evaluate their facility needs and submit a new/revised CEFP.

***Data processing system for the program:*** The SBA maintains the data processing system for grant awards to counties and the related requisition payments. This internal system is on a local area network (LAN) and any needed updates are performed by its staff.

***Technology enhancements:*** The Office of Technology and Information Systems currently operates the following programs:

- West Virginia Microcomputer Educational Network (WVMEN)
  The WVMEN has three major components:

  - the state-wide telecommunications network;

  - 86 microcomputer local area network labs in secondary schools and vocational/technical centers; and

  - the concept and implementation of 8 RESA computer technicians.

- Satellite-Related Distance Learning
  County school systems can choose to implement a variety of programming options ranging from credit courses for students to teleconferences for curriculum enrichment and staff development. With the assistance of the Educational Broadcasting Authority, the Department of Education provides grants to local school districts for distance learning hardware and programming.

- Basics Skills/Computer Education
  In 1989, House Bill 2326 provided basic skills development, remediation, and acceleration through the use of computers for elementary students. This plan will utilize $7,000,000 per year for the next ten years from lottery money and grants from the SBA.

- Technology Demonstration Project
  During the 1990 extraordinary legislative session, $150,000 was earmarked for a technology demonstration project in the areas of teacher preparation and productivity.

*Non-traditional use of public school facilities:* West Virginia does not currently have a formal program in place to promote the non-traditional use of public school facilities.

# Survey States' Support of K–12 Education
# FY 1989

| | Per Capita Expenditures | K–12 as a Percent of Adjusted Total General Expenditures |
|---|---|---|
| Alaska | $948 | 15.43% |
| Connecticut | $379 | 18.22% |
| Florida | $351 | 27.41% |
| Georgia | $447 | 33.07% |
| Illinois | $299 | 21.92% |
| Kentucky | $396 | 26.30% |
| Maine | $420 | 22.82% |
| Maryland | $256 | 16.75% |
| Massachusetts | $341 | 13.70% |
| New Mexico | $621 | 30.04% |
| Washington | $559 | 31.44% |
| West Virginia | $440 | 30.04% |
| Idaho | $369 | 28.61% |

Source: State Government Finances in 1989, U.S. Department of Commerce

782\States.Wk1

## APPENDIX A

## DETAILED LIST OF PRIORITY FACTORS AND WEIGHTS FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA

Projects are evaluated using the following order of priorities and weights.

Priority Type I - Life/Safety

| Weight | Factor |
|---|---|
| 50 | Evaluation of a report of the appropriate regulatory agency(s) (e.g., Fire Marshal) and/or evaluation of the architectural/engineering report |
| 20 | The Department staff's evaluation of need as the result of an on-site review |
| 10 | The district's ranking of the project |
| 15 | Project need based on the district's ability to provide educational services through an alternate facility |
| 20 | The seriousness of the nature of a problem that could result in bodily injury or death |
| 20 | Has this project been partially funded by previous legislation (e.g., planning and design)? |
| 15 | LCC analysis, if applicable (i.e. a new facility rather than an upgrade is being considered) |

Priority Type II - Unhoused Students

| Weight | Factor |
|---|---|
| 40 | The percentage of students that are classed as unhoused by service area as defined in regulation |
| 20 | Alternate available means to deliver the necessary educational programs |
| 15 | Method currently being used by the district to cope with the problem |
| 20 | Quality and accuracy of the demographic analysis supporting the district's claim |
| 15 | Analysis of the Department of Labor's current population projections supporting the district's request |
| 20 | The general condition and quality of the facility currently being used to house students |

| | |
|---|---|
| 10 | The district's ranking of the project |
| 20 | Has this project been partially funded by previous legislation (e.g., planning and design)? |
| 15 | Verification that the situation cannot be relieved by adjusting boundaries of the service area and transporting students to nearby schools |

Priority Type III - Protection of Structure

| Weight | Factor |
|---|---|
| 25 | District's report |
| 40 | Engineering study |
| 10 | District's ranking of project |
| 20 | Has this project been partially funded by previous legislation (e.g., planning and design)? |
| 20 | History of the repair and maintenance to the building component |

Priority Type IV - Code Upgrade

| Weight | Factor |
|---|---|
| 15 | Type of code upgrade |
| 15 | Alternatives |
| 50 | Copy of report from the appropriate regulatory agency(s) and/or copy of engineering report |
| 20 | History of the repair and maintenance |
| 10 | District's ranking of project |

Priority Type V - Operational Cost Savings

| Weight | Factor |
|---|---|
| | District's ranking of the project |
| | Relationship of the cost of the project to the annual savings in operational costs |

Weights have not yet been determined for this priority as adequate funding has not been available to fund projects at this priority level.

Priority Type VI - Functional Upgrade

| Weight | Factor |
|---|---|
| | District's ranking of the project |
| | Instructional program affected |

Weights have not yet been determined for this priority as adequate funding has not been available to fund projects at this priority level.

## APPENDIX B

## DETAILED LIST OF PRIORITY FACTORS FOR THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Projects are evaluated using the following priorities. The priority factors differ for each source of funding (PECO, CO&DS).

- PECO Funds
  - Priority A - General Instructional Facilities, include:
    * needed student stations;
    * sites/site additions;
    * site development/improvement;
    * remodeling/renovating;
    * replacing/renovating heating, cooling or lighting system(s);
    * restoring to previous condition when damaged by providential causes;
    * replacing roof/roof membranes; and
    * correcting deficiencies in safety to life, health and sanitation.
  - Priority B - Special and Auxiliary Facilities, include:
    * improving instructional program(s);
    * ancillary facilities;
    * site improvement(s); and
    * purchasing/replacing equipment in existing facilities.
  - Priority C - Facilities Maintenance

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## APPENDIX C

## DETAILED LIST OF PRIORITY FACTORS AND WEIGHTS FOR THE STATE OF MAINE

Projects are evaluated using the following order of priorities and weights.

A. Regular Projects - 200 total points

1. Building and Grounds - 72 total points

   a. Safety Hazards - 38 points
   b. Obsolete and/or Unsuitable - 34 points

2. School Population - 68 total points

   a. Overcrowding - 44 points
   b. Enrollment Estimates & Population Shifts - 24 points

3. Program - 60 points total

   a. Facilities to Enhance - 30 points
   b. Facilities for New Programs - 30 points

Note: In the case of ties during the rating process,

   a. project with more points in #1 shall be placed first;
   b. if a tie still exists, project with more points in #2 shall be placed first; and
   c. if a tie still exists, project benefiting larger number of students shall be placed first.

B. Special Projects - 200 total points

- Any construction project with maximum of 8,000 sq. ft.
- Costs necessary to bring a building into conformance with current mechanical and handicapped codes.

1. Safety Hazards - 72 points total

   a. Building - 60 points
   b. Grounds - 12 points

2. Completion of Facility - 68 points total

3. Overcrowding - 60 points total



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C. Replacement of Leased Space Projects - 200 total points

- Limited to additions to existing facilities to eliminate need for portables or other types of leased space to house instructional programs.

- Funding will only include cost of constructing instructional programs and related facilities and will not include remodeling of existing facility or cost of bringing existing facility into code conformance.

- Instructional space includes classrooms, labs, library, guidance, multi-purpose room, music, art, and small group instruction. Normal and appropriate circulation space are also included.

1. Number of Leased Spaces to be Replaced - 80 points total

   a. Portable Classrooms - 10 points each
   b. Off-Site Leased Space (various points given for regular classrooms, small group rooms, tutorial space, and other)

2. Age of Building - 65 points total

   a. 1 - 7-years-old - 65 points
   b. 8 - 15-years-old - 45 points
   c. 16-years-old and over - 35 points

3. Enrollment Estimates - 55 points total

   Estimates based on cohort projections for up to 5 years, modified, if or as appropriate.

APPENDIX D

SURVEY INSTRUMENT
STATE CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

MGT of America, Inc.

219 W. Fifth Avenue • Olympia, Washington 98501 • (206) 352-5322

February 6, 1992

Ms. Diane Price
Director, School Facilities
and Management Services
Massachusetts Department of Education
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, MA 02169

Dear Ms. Price:

MGT of America, Inc. is currently conducting a school facilities needs assessment study for the state of Idaho. One component of this year-long study is a review of the construction assistance program in twelve other states. We have gathered data from several national sources, including the 1990 New Jersey survey of state school facility programs. Based on this information, the Committee asked us to contact you and request some additional information concerning your construction program.

In order to augment the information we have gathered, we have designed the enclosed short survey. Several survey questions for which we have data have been completed; please verify the accuracy of this information and correct as necessary. I will contact you the week of February 17th to complete the survey.

Thank you in advance for your assistance with this portion of this important study. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or Denis Curry at (206) 352-5322.

Sincerely,

Angelyn Bagwell

Angelyn Bagwell
Senior Analyst

enclosures

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATE OF IDAHO
SCHOOL FACILITIES NEEDS ASSESSMENT STUDY

SURVEY OF STATES' CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Space has been provided below for your written answers; however, if you need more space, please feel free to attach additional pages.

1. Agency administering construction assistance program

2. Size of program: Current appropriation (indicate whether annual or biennial

3. Funding source(s)

4. State matching ratio

5. Eligibility criteria

6. Priority factors and weights

7. Source(s) of local matching and type of majority vote requirement

8. Space standards used, if any

9. Characteristics of program operation

10. Is a periodic needs assessment a requirement?

Yes ____ No ____

If yes, how often?

11. What agency maintains the data processing system for the program and how is it updated?

Agency:

Update:

12. Does your state *have a program in place to fund* technology enhancements in public schools?

Yes ____ No ____

If yes, what is the nature and operation of the program?

13. Does your state have a program in place to promote non-traditional use of public school facilities?

Yes ____ No ____

If yes, what is the nature and operation of the program?